New York Tribune.

First to Last—the Truth: News—Editorials—Advertisements.

WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 1, 1915.

Owned and published daily by The Tribune Association, a New York corporation. Ogden M. Reid, President; G. Vernon Rogers, Secretary and Treasurer. Address Tribune Building, No. 154 Nassau Street, New York.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES—By Mail, Postage Paid, outside of Greater New York.

Daily & Sunday, 1 mo. $ .75 | Daily only, 1 month $ .50
Daily & Sunday, 3 mos. 2.25 | Daily only, 3 months 1.50
Daily & Sunday, 1 year 9.00 | Daily only, 1 year 6.00
Sunday only, 3 months 1.25 | Sunday only, 1 year 2.50

FOREIGN RATES		CANADIAN RATES	
DAILY AND SUNDAY		DAILY AND SUNDAY	
One month	$1.54	One month	$ .75
One year	22.67	One year	8.50
SUNDAY ONLY		DAILY ONLY	
Six months	2.33	One month	.50
One year	4.66	One year	6.00
DAILY ONLY		SUNDAY ONLY	
One month	1.29	One month	.50
One year	15.39	One year	4.58

Entered at the Postoffice at New York as Second Class Mail Matter.

German "Concessions."

At a moment when there is patent prospect of a peaceful settlement of the dispute with Germany there is a natural desire to avoid discussion of the sort which provokes bitterness and bad feeling. Yet there is one fact that every American citizen should bear in mind now and hereafter.

Whatever policy Germany now adopts, to whatever lengths she may decide to go in repudiating her earlier acts, she is making no "concessions" to the United States, she is bestowing no favors, she is making no sacrifice of rights or privileges. She is merely foregoing practices which were illegal and inhuman. She is simply abandoning policy of assassination.

It is a mischievous and vicious idea that certain Germanophile publications and persons are now attempting to circulate, this idea of "concessions." Their object in circulating it is plain. If Germany were actually making concessions she would be entitled to look for counterbalancing concessions from this country. This is what German sympathizers are aiming at.

Let us keep the fact always before us—Germany asserted the right to murder Americans. She exercised the alleged right in the case of the Falaba, the Lusitania and the Arabic. She exercised it until she was faced with the alternative of abandoning it or of seeing the American Ambassador at Berlin recalled and Bernstorff sent home.

If Germany has now decided to forego her campaign of murder it is no more a concession than would be the similar decision of a Black Hand operator who, faced with the necessity of suffering the consequences of his crimes or of consenting to live under the law, elected to give up the bomb and the knife for his own comfort.

It is not to suit any purpose of the United States that Germany has yielded—if she has, in fact, as seems probable. It is not any right that she has surrendered. We shall owe her nothing because she consents to let our women and children live on the high seas. There is no favor here, no "concession."

The German submarine practices have been an abomination. They were an offence against common humanity and violated all law and precedent. But to them Germany clung until she was faced with the necessity of choosing between an open break with the United States and a repudiation of her system of assassination. Then, apparently, she decided that a break with this country would be the more costly.

The single point at issue between the United States and Germany is that involving the lives of American citizens. Germany has murdered, and until recently insisted on continuing to murder, Americans travelling lawfully on the high seas. It is inconceivable that any American can regard a change now as a "concession." As well might one regard the renunciation of crime by a leader of an East Side gang as a concession to society.

There is no occasion to assail the good faith of German statesmanship in the present case. It is idle to attempt to forecast what German purpose may be. It is possible that the purpose behind the present change of tone and policy may rest upon a real anxiety to avoid an open break with the United States. Until there is evidence to disprove this, there is no cause for any attack upon German motives.

But let us not be deceived, taken in, hoaxed by any German protestation or plausible statements. If German yielding to American demands now be accepted as a "concession," then our whole case falls to the ground. If the government of the Kaiser can "concede" the right of American citizens to life and safety at sea, when they are entitled to life and safety—then the American Government has indeed become a sorry thing and national honor a mere phrase.

Let the Germans explain their change in policy to their own public as they choose, but let us understand clearly that what they are doing is recognizing rights which are not theirs to confer or abbreviate—abandoning anarchy to live under the law and doing it because they believe it is more profitable for them, not because they like us or desire to serve us.

Enter the College Bred Policeman.

The policemen of Berkeley, Cal., have been requested to attend the University of California not as candidates for the degree of Bachelor of Arts, but simply to pursue a course of study in the relation of mental disease to criminology. Yet even this modest nibble at the academic fare will constitute them rah rahs, will it not? They will of necessity tread the classic paths at the stroke of the hour, sit under the lecturer through long periods of mental wakefulness or somnolence, be chided for inattention, consult the library, do a great many of those things whose constant repetition produces much of that amiable insanity so picturesquely expressed on the bleachers at an intercollegiate contest.

It is really a problem to know which to congratulate the more, the policemen of Berkeley or the University of California, on this interesting educational experiment. To be both a collegian and a policeman will be something of a distinction in a society which hitherto has rated brawn and brogue above brains in its guardians of the law. On the other hand, the success of a university in these days is measured by its ability to relate itself to the many diverse currents of human activity in its community and state. In gathering in with its powerful tentacles the trustful and unsuspecting "bulls" of Berkeley the University of California is, so far as we know, giving even the University of Wisconsin and the University of Kansas a pointer or two.

But after mastering the relation of mental disease to criminology (policemen can do anything!) will Berkeley's guardians alter their methods when breaking up a crap game among messenger boys, raiding a den of iniquity or drawing a bead on a burglar? We hope for Berkeley's sake that a more philosophical or pathological point of view will not breed in them a Hamlet-like hesitation when approaching the lawbreaker. "To do or not to do?" is a question best asked after the culprit is safely in custody, and answered—with all due respect to the University of California and its prospective pupils—by alienists or juries or both, however glaring their defects of judgment.

"An Investment in the Future."

We have received the appended letter, which is commended to the careful, sympathetic consideration of those readers who take chances in futures:

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: I hold a hostage from the war. It is the bonniest little Belgian baby, with the sweetest of smiles and an angelic look in his dark eyes. With his fine head, I think some day he will be a leader of men, and maybe help to build up Belgium again.

Little George was born at a Red Cross maternity hospital in town, where my sister and I went to help the refugee women. His mother was very ill after his birth; she has never had anything to do with the baby and is therefore helpless with him, especially as she can only give him her own name. His father is in the trenches fighting. My sister brought the baby here when he was not three weeks old, that he might be well looked after in country air.

I am offering to some of the readers of The Tribune a great chance—an investment in the future. What the baby needs is a little income to secure him against the chances of fortune until he can fight his own way in the world. I give him all I can in the shape of care, which is all his blessed ignorance is conscious of needing now; but my pennies are few, and he does need some expenditures and will need others in the future which I can hardly compass.

What can you do for a brave Belgian baby's sake? I send this appeal in faith across the Atlantic to generous America.

EMILIE FEWSTER JONES.

Crawford, Tilehurst, Berks, Aug. 12, 1915.

The work that societies and institutions are doing in cases like this is fine. Finer yet is the solicitude and loving care of an individual taking the place of the helpless mother of this wee refugee who may some day "be a leader of men and help to build up Belgium." To co-operate in making that possible—even to co-operate in raising this baby to be an honest, useful citizen—is no small privilege. It is an investment in the future which would yield dividends outside the reach of speculative misfortune or material disaster.

Repeating a Blunder.

The next act in the comedy of intervention or near-intervention in Mexican affairs seems to contemplate a pacification conference from which General Carranza is again to be shut out. That would be to invite a repetition of the failure of the futile Niagara Falls conference. When General Huerta declined to yield two years ago to President Wilson's ultimatum, the A. B. C. powers were called in to help restore order and harmony in Mexico. The A. B. C. mediators asked General Carranza as First Chief of the Constitutional movement to send representatives to the conference. When he manifested some curiosity as to the scope of the mediatory proceedings the invitation was cancelled. The conference failed utterly in its object because while it sat Huerta's power crumbled and the excluded Constitutional element became the controlling factor in the Mexican situation.

It is hard to see how a second pacification conference, attended by representatives of the declining Villa and Zapata factions and by some other unattached Mexican statesmen, can accomplish anything more than the Niagara Falls gathering accomplished. When Carranza was ignored in 1913 he had possession of only a few states in Northern Mexico. Now his power, or that of the generals under him, extends over much the greater part of the republic. He occupies Vera Cruz, the chief seaport, and has military control of Mexico City, the federal district. His armies are the only ones capable of maintaining the fiction of an organized central government.

If it was an error to count him out of a settlement two years ago, it would be still more of an error to count him out of one now. In the condition of semi-anarchy into which Mexico has fallen he represents about the only force competent to restore order and to pave the way for a restoration of civil government.

One of the greatest weaknesses of the administration's policy in Mexico has been its subordinating a restoration of order, under which American lives and property would again find some degree of protection, to a desire to advance some Mexican leaders and to discipline others. Our government has been more concerned about boycotting Huerta and undermining Carranza than it has been about using to the best advantage whatever forces were available for the extinction of anarchy.

A conference in which Carranza's defeated enemies will be the chief figures cannot be expected to end civil war and to re-establish peace. Carranza is *persona non grata* at Washington because he is self-opinionated, punctilious and difficult to handle. But he has lasted longer than any other of the revolutionary leaders and his government is more firmly established now than it was last year or year before last. A Mexican settlement in which he had no part would hold out no greater promise of efficacy than did the still-born protocols of the first A. B. C. fiasco, unless it had behind it the military force of the American powers. And it is clear that the South American states will not be parties to the sort of intervention which would be required to dislodge Carranza and to set up in his place a provisional President in whose selection the Carranzistas had no voice.

Crippling Invisible Government.

The short ballot proposal which Mr. Root's splendid speech did so much to put through the Constitutional Convention is a curious compound. It is a thoroughgoing department reorganization scheme and while *it* has notable flaws, it is on the whole a good one. But it is not the short ballot, as that term has been understood, and as it was even made semi-authoritative, so far as Republicans were concerned, in the adoption by a Republican Assembly of a resolution for appointment of all state officers save Governor and Lieutenant Governor.

Mr. Root pleaded for the abolishment of invisible government. With stirring fervor he pointed out the course of invisible government—boss government—within the two great parties in New York for the last forty years, citing instances, naming names within the knowledge and experience of every man in the convention. He gave his personal testimony, and nobody could speak with more authority, for what the public has well known—that in that time Governors were not Governors, state officers were not state officers; they were not public servants actually, but, sometimes willingly, sometimes against their will, they were the servants of the political machine which controlled nominations and insisted on being fed with jobs. Out of this machine control came the multiplication of bureaus and offices, the confusion of jurisdiction, the loss, the waste, the graft, which even so great and independent an executive as Hughes was unable to prevent. Out of that also came the short ballot idea—that if only the Governor were elected, and if he had a free hand to appoint and remove his cabinet and department heads as he deemed wise, he would be able to defy and circumvent the boss—invisible government—if he desired.

It is greatly to be regretted that Mr. Root and Mr. Tanner, having the vision to see the desirability of this and the courage to fight for it, were unwilling to make their fight for the unadulterated scheme rather than for a compromise demanded by jobholders and agents of the machine. They have practically assured the adoption of their plan, even better than when they first proposed it, but it does not leave the Governor as free and as responsible as he should be. There remain as elective officers the Controller and the Attorney General, each with large functions, each with great patronage at his disposal. In other words, two of the strongest fortifications of invisible government as Mr. Root denounced it remain at its command. On the other hand, the Governor is to be permitted to appoint most of his aids without Senate confirmation—and this is a genuine blow at the power of the machine, through its legislative agents, to take a hand in appointments supposed to be made wholly by the executive.

This plan will not kill invisible government; it may cripple it, at least. Perhaps a step in advance is all that it is humanly possible to make at a time. At any rate, this step, though not as long as it might have been, is in the right direction, and for that it should have the public's approval.

Too Good To Be True.

The report that William G. McAdoo will seek the Democratic nomination for Governor in this state will not be credited in Republican circles. It will be regarded as news too good to be true.

But if the primary law permitted there would be thousands of Republicans who would enter the Democratic primaries solely to contribute their aid to the nomination of the man who would be the unanimous choice of all Republicans—as the Democratic nominee.

"The work which I have mapped out for my remaining years," says Mr. William Jennings Bryan, "does not include the occupying of any political position." The latter is to be a mere incident to Chautauqua lecturing, then, like the Secretaryship of State.

While some of Nordica's diamonds may have been paste, her gems of song weren't.

Is it a case of "root, hog, or die" with the short ballot?

"Lost His Loot at Gambling."—Headline. Maybe the "second thief is best owner."

"The Crown Prince's Mixture."

(From *The Westminster Gazette*.)

Arrack, a bottle of which, combined with ether, and called "Crown Prince's Mixture," is said to be given to German soldiers to inspire them with "Dutch courage" before great onslaughts, must be familiar to most people who have travelled in the East. It should, properly speaking, be made from the flowers or "toddy" of the coco palm, but the orthodox recipe is not rigidly observed. In Egypt "araki," a fiery beverage called "fixed bayonets" by British soldiers, and drunk by pious Moslems, not being technically the "wine" forbidden by the Koran, is said to be obtained from the date palm. Of recent years large quantities of arrack have been distilled in Germany and Holland from rice and molasses. Ether, the other ingredient in this royal hell broth, sometimes supplants whiskey in Ireland, where, according to one medical authority, "the practice of ether drinking is widely prevalent."

THE PLATTSBURG CACKLER

He Deserves a Wreath For His Anserine Services.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Thanks to The Tribune for printing in its issue of August 28 the news item from another paper that reveals the identity of the vigilant patriot who "caused the matter of General Wood's conduct at Plattsburg to be drawn to the attention of the Secretary of War, Garrison." His name then was Oswald Garrison Villard.

It is said that the cackling of geese once saved Rome, and that thereafter the Roman people kept in recognition a flock of geese in the Capitol. Are we imitating them? But there was a difference in the point of attack between those venerable birds and our American variety. The Roman goose directed his hissings at the approach of a foreign foe; our species is vocable only against such of our own citizens as have founded the National Security League, the Loyal Legion, and the many others who have attempted to arouse the nation from its defenceless sleep.

You see, in ancient times the German-American mind had not yet been invented whereby it is possible for a citizen to entertain in public the representative of the murderers of his fellows, and then hasten to pass beneath his country's flag on an errand of warning to the government against the perils of militarism from within!

Let us, then, if the newspaper reports of his services be true, bestow a civic wreath upon this patriot of the new order, who has saved us from the foe at Plattsburg! A wreath of onions, that he may be moved to mingle his tears with Von Bernstorff's over the ocean graves of our women and children.

I shall be glad to contribute one pfennig to this testimonial of a nation's respect for him and to receive further contributions toward the same. G. L. STOWELL.

Dorset, Vt., Aug. 30, 1915.

Edgar M. Ward.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: The death of the late Edgar M. Ward this summer marks the passing of a notable figure from the field of art. Though Mr. Ward had not been a contributor to exhibitions in recent years, we recall with pleasure his important examples, and it would seem fitting at this time to pause for a moment and reflect.

Consider, if we might, what his work has meant to our art and means to us now. There is no overlooking the fact that he gave us in his allotted time a number of pieces quite in a class by themselves, examples with a manner of rendering we may do well to profit by, especially since a return to more academic methods seems expedient. To those of us who are not lost or entirely bewildered by what the so-called modernists are trying to put over, it is a joy in contrast to meditate before such works as Ward's, distinguished always by that superb drawing, where, with remarkable fidelity and style, he presented his interesting characters in their picturesque setting. Combine with this his consummate skill as a painter, and you have the making of a number of examples many of which might stand first among a number of contemporary works.

He was not a prolific worker, having given much of his time to instruction at the academy; so much so that it had become proverbial in the profession to have studied under Ward, and I might add here that many of us owe to him a lasting debt of gratitude for guidance on that hard, uncertain road. He himself had travelled it in those early days abroad, and accounts are given of him by old associates of his popularity and how he led the student colony, American and English, while in Paris, who would later betake themselves to Pontoise, France. How they all looked up to him, for he was honor student at the Ecole de Beaux-Arts, having been awarded highest marks in Gabanel's atelier.

In his time he more than fulfilled his promise. His picture at the Metropolitan Museum, "The Coppersmith," stands not only as a signal example, but may be counted as one among a number of examples which go to prove the value of his attainments.

New York, Aug. 25, 1915. W. F. K.

Government and Taxes.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Government is the people associated together for the welfare of all, and when equitably and justly administered produces prosperity, peace, security, patriotism, contentment and blessing.

Nowhere is the system of government tested in its equity and fairness as in its taxes. Upon this point of government rests its permanence and continuity of equity and justice. Unequal taxation gives birth to and fosters class legislation, which is destructive of any government, democratic or monarchical.

The money collected for the support of government is now collected from only a part of property, thereby forcing upon a part of the people the obligations of government that rightly belong to the other part. This has naturally divided the people into classes—those who pay and those who do not pay their obligations of government—a responsible and an irresponsible element that continue dissatisfaction to open hostilities, class hatred.

An equitable and just tax upon all property without discrimination would readjust present conditions of unrest upon a basis of fairness which would secure confidence in government and also secure its future continuance upon the broad lines of prosperity for all. It has never been intended "by any sane government" to diminish or take away any part of capital value, but only some part of the revenue arising from it, except when transferred from the dead to the living.

It is a disgrace to humanity, a travesty of civilization, when the non-taxpayers can outvote the taxpayers and extort from them not only the revenue but a part of the capital, applying the same to their own uses. Whether it be done by legal trickery or highway hold-up, it is extremely dishonest, resulting only in disaster and ruin to all concerned. W. FRED SILLECK.

Brooklyn, Aug. 28, 1915.

Wanted—A Jiu-Jitsu Mate.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Formerly men paid much attention to physical self-defence. But to-day sword and gun are denied the citizen. In attacks or emergencies that occur—on the street, in cars, on ships—what shall one do barehanded to establish order or subdue the other fellow?

Great size and strength belong to few. Athletes praise boxing and wrestling—the manly arts. But size anyway is a big factor.

The Japanese jiu-jitsu always appealed to me. Medium size and strength are no handicaps. It capitalizes them. The result is quick—seldom protracted into long bouts.

Not to become pugnacious, but for confidence, I want to spend part of my time on jiu-jitsu. Book instruction and theoretical practice on one's self count for nothing. The idea is to have a mate and for each to study grips and holds methodically, possibly taking rudimentary lessons from a reliable teacher.

I wonder if, of the many readers of your letters, preferably among the younger men like myself, any think along the lines that I do. M. H. NILGRAM.

New York, Aug. 25, 1915.

"AS A GREAT CONCESSION, I'LL LET YOU LIVE!"

"FROM BERLIN TO BAGDAD"

A Communication Which, to Confound the Author, Is Printed with Thanks.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: If restraint is a sign of culture you may attribute to me a goodly measure of that much debated quality, for I have until now refrained from commenting on your editorials in spite of the many provocations which they have furnished me. I do not believe in condemning where I cannot at the same time commend. However, your editorial sheet of to-day, both sides of it, stands unique among recent issues of The Tribune, both for its impersonality of tone and its sweep of historical imagination.

"From Berlin to Bagdad" comes closer to a complete comprehension of the "underlying" causes of the war than anything which I have seen from the pen of a New York editor, not excepting Mr. Ridder. To be sure, the substance of this article has long been stock knowledge to a limited number of thinking people, people whose powers of discrimination are not destroyed by the reiteration of such clap-trap phrases as "German frightfulness," "America first," "the Belgian atrocities," "English international philanthropism," etc. Those who rest their judgments upon the broad facts of history (among Englishmen, notably Hilaire Belloc, Bertrand Russell, G. Bernard Shaw, G. Lowes Dickinson) rather than upon isolated theatrical byplays have not failed, from the very beginning, to note the real trend of the war.

The early march of the English up the Euphrates Valley toward Bagdad, while not a conspicuous event, was of tremendous significance to those who discriminate between the apparent and the real. The facts about the Bagdad Railway which you now present, seemingly for the first time, have long been known to the Germans themselves. One of the first things which my father told me when he returned from Germany last September was that this very railway had created more friction between the English and the Germans than any other factor or group of factors. In spite of its lack of esoteric originality, your own article will have a deserved novelty and greatness in the eyes of the large majority of people. You cannot advance the cause of universal welfare in any better way than by similar attempts to promote universal intelligence; and you can promote universal intelligence much more quickly by presenting historical facts than by transcribing the emotional paroxysms into which they sometimes send you.

The same friendly criticism applies to the other side of this remarkable sheet. The first editorial presents the true genius of the German people far better than any editorial which has thus far come to my notice. To be sure, the substance of the article is not original, for it consists almost entirely of quotations. However, the interlarded comments are quite original, and the editor is to be highly admired for the unqualified admiration which he shows for another man's explanation of German militarism, especially as the explanation is almost diametrically opposed to the theory so vehemently advanced by The Tribune and most of its contemporaries. I sincerely hope that the editorial was not due to an oversight, or to the uncensored ambition of some youthful but philosophical member of your staff. It is almost too dispassionate to have emanated from the eloquent pen of him who usually ornaments that particular space.

"Byran's Reward" is a gem. Not even the somewhat labored wit of your famed rival has approached this fragrant distillation of a thousand epithets. An ounce of such light-fingered irony is worth a ton of vituperation. The greater pity, therefore, that its heels should be trodden by the coarse spite of the last line of "A Royal Request." Really, Mr. Editor, it was not worthy. The hope persists that this is the element of strangeness which must mar all perfection, and yet——

"German Air Raids" is a very clever attempt to analyze one of the most profound traits in the German character. The editor sees in the "childlike imagination" of the German people the sign of an inherent weakness and the prophecy of an ultimate failure. To me, if my dissenting voice may be pardoned, this is the most hopeful sign in the German nation. That such florescent romanticism should walk hand in hand with such deadly efficiency (I must use the word to bring out the contrast), that the genius of a Russian campaign should be compatible with the genius of the childish shout, "A balloon!"—well, to put it mildly, there is still hope for the land of the Christmas tree.

As regards the publication of this letter, you will do as you please. I have noticed that most editors publish only two kinds of letters, those that are so unreserved in their approval of the editor as to vindicate themselves, and those that are so fanatically condemnatory as to refute themselves. The rarest of communications, and at the same time the most dangerous for the editor, is the one that discriminates between the true and the false. Such a letter can "show up" an editor better than a thousand vials of wrath poured out into print. Hence, I doubt very much if it will be possible for you to publish this letter. However, I should feel quite content if you were to circulate it among the members of your staff.

As a parting word, Mr. Editor, let me say that the severest punishment which I can wish you for some of your editorials against Germany and the hyphenated German-Americans is the punishment of reading your own editorials about three years from now. Could I devise any fate more poetically just?

HENRY C. LINK.

Yale Station, New Haven, Aug. 29, 1915.

Stoning a Prophet.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: I want to thank you for your cartoon of General Wood this morning and feel sure that all who recognize selfless devotion to duty, honor and country join me. He is a great tragic figure in the world to-day—feeling tremendous responsibility poignantly; seeing with cruel clearness the peril of his country and its urgent need, he has talked ceaselessly to deaf ears. He has had to bear hearing

"The truth he's spoken
Twisted by knaves to make a trap for fools,
And watched the things he gave his live to, broken,
And stooped and built them up with worn-out tools."

If ever war comes upon us and we suffer for our smug self-complacency the blame will all fall upon the man whose life has been given to avert such a disaster. He is our Lord Roberts—twin spirit to the "Bobs" who died heartbroken at the failure of his country. We must always stone our prophets, it seems, at least our true ones. You are right. "He can stand it."

AN OFFICER'S WIFE.

New York, Aug. 28, 1915.

Advice to the Press.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: If the press of this country would demand of Congress that the obnoxious war tax be raised by imposing a duty on war material exported, and thus place the burden of taxation on those who are either responsible for or deriving a profit from the war, the people who pay this tax and support the press would feel that their interests were being better protected than by the positive assurances of the press that 75 per cent of the people favor severing diplomatic relations with Germany for the purpose of upholding a technicality of international law, of no interest to any one but those desiring to travel on ships of belligerent nations in time of war.

As a representative of patriotic Americans, I would ask that the press devote more time to bringing about results of practical value to the people and less space to influencing results that might impoverish them.

F. W. RICHARDSON.

New York, Aug. 26, 1915.

An Unwarranted Reprimand.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: A public reprimand to a military officer, particularly to one of high rank, is a punishment of no light character. It is one of the punishments prescribed by the regulations that may be imposed by sentence of a court martial.

Indeed, it has been questioned whether otherwise there is any legal authority for it. It seems hardly necessary to add that in the case of General Wood there is no court, martial or civil, that would have found him guilty of any offence for his connection with the Roosevelt incident, or subjected him therefor to any punishment or obloquy whatever. G. P. MONTAGUE.

New York, Aug. 28, 1915.

ROOSEVELT'S GREAT SERVICE

Telling the Truth Where Truth Is Sorely Needed.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: A few days ago you permitted to appear on your editorial page a cartoon in which Theodore Roosevelt was caricatured with grotesque and meaningless misrepresentation. A day or two thereafter your leading editorial asserts that the "Colonel tells the sober truth," defending the message, if not the manner, of his Plattsburg speech. The petty attack of the cartoon, followed immediately by the candid and courageous defence by the editorial, struck me as revealing a serious weakness in The Tribune's stand at a time when resolute firmness is our country's desperate need.

The weakness lies in yielding to the easy tendency of ridiculing our energetic ex-President, while his thorough sincerity and service for righteousness are recognized and acknowledged. If The Tribune respects Mr. Roosevelt's patriotism and fearlessness when indifference and timidity are our national reproach, not to say disgrace, then it belongs to The Tribune to honor Theodore Roosevelt as the outstanding exponent of those qualities to which the ideals of William Jennings Bryan stand as the antithesis, and of which the behavior of our present administration reveals a pitiful lack.

Very many people cannot account for Mr. Roosevelt's outspoken denunciation of what he believes to be wrong. To say what one means and to mean what one says is so foreign to the public utterances of so many of our public men that we have come to attribute great mentality to those in political life who talk and write so that they cannot be understood.

Of course, Mr. Roosevelt's advocacy of preparedness has no more to do with precipitating war than the personal development of manly physique, muscular strength and athletic prowess has to do with designing murder. Mr. Roosevelt's Presidency was distinguished by the restoration of peace through his personal intervention when domestic strife and international warfare had long prevailed, and never was the Nobel peace prize more meritoriously bestowed than upon this champion of right at any price.

To earnestly desire peace is not to prevent war. If war is a possibility, however remote, it is criminal not to be ready for the contingency should it arrive. Every war in which this nation has engaged in the past has been a spectacle of unpreparedness in which greater loss of precious life was due to our own stupidity and neglect than to the enemy's valor.

Theodore Roosevelt is a patriot demanding the conservation of his country's strength for the time of need, which may be imminent. He has devoted his entire brilliant career to his country's service. Is America so surfeited with disinterested patriotism that The Tribune can afford to attempt to belittle Theodore Roosevelt?

EDWARD F. STEVENS.

Shoreham, L. I., Aug. 27, 1915.

On the Colonel's Trail.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: The insults which Theodore Roosevelt has cast upon the sons of the Fatherland will not go unanswered, as the elections of 1916 will show. No matter what the English-American press may say, we Germans and German-Americans, holding as we do a balance of political power, will decide the national election. Then we will tend to Theodore and any who may be in sympathy with his unpatriotic ideas. H. KLUTSCH.

Brooklyn, Aug. 28, 1915.

For All Neutrals or for Ourselves Only?

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: In the early days of our foreign troubles it seems to me that we heard much about our government championing the cause of all neutrals on the high seas. Now we seem to be demanding only safety for Americans. Am I wrong? Did we never undertake more than protection for our own people?

Thanks for your clear and fair editorials.

New York, Aug. 28, 1915. QUERY.